

Labour Conditions

were stopped because the amounts appropriated for carrying out the 1964-65 works by the federal and provincial governments have not yet been paid, thus restricting the credit facilities of municipalities which were unable to borrow the required amounts for the 1965-66 works. As a result, the works for the current season have been suspended.

Such is the specific purpose of my motion. The matter is important. First, because we find that the statute governing winter works has become inoperative; second, it is an important matter since it is impossible to know which government, the federal or the provincial, is responsible for the delay in payments for winter works that were carried out two years ago; third, it is also an important problem because this seems to happen only in the province of Quebec—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but he must, at this time, limit his remarks to the matter of the urgency and not to that of the importance of the issue he would like to have debated.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, here is why the problem is urgent:

First, with each passing day thousands of Canadians in many municipalities are deprived of their livelihood and are thus prevented from enjoying a minimum standard of living in Canada.

Second, in order to point out the urgency of the problem with which we are concerned today, I ask for the support of the new Minister of Manpower for the workers who are most in need, those who have lost their jobs and are waiting for winter works in order to obtain the necessities of life—

Mr. Speaker: As the hon. member for Lapointe knows, we should at this time consider, not the importance of the question he raises, but the urgency of the debate.

I would ask him to refer to section 100 (3), in *Beauchesne*, which reads as follows:

"Urgency" within this rule does not apply to the matter itself, but it means "urgency of debate", when the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the House do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough and public interest demands that discussion take place immediately.

There is no doubt that the question raised by the hon. member for Lapointe is very important, but I should like to remind him that he will have an opportunity to discuss it during the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

In the circumstances I do not feel that it would be possible for me to accept a motion for the adjournment of the current business of the house at this time.

[*English*]

URANIUM**POSSIBLE CHANGE IN TERMS RESPECTING SALES TO FRANCE**

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Prime Minister in connection with the negotiations between Canada and France relative to the alteration of the existing terms regarding uranium sales, that they ought not to be made except for peaceful purposes. Have there been changes made in this regard respecting the sale, or the hoped for sale, between Consolidated Denison Mines and France? When were the changes made, and what are the circumstances connected therewith, in view of the fact that the general desire is to prevent expansion in the field of potential nuclear warfare?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the policy on this matter of using uranium for peaceful purposes only in its application to discussions with France and other countries has been stated in the house, and there has been no change in that policy. In respect of the particular discussions to which my right hon. friend has referred—and I acknowledge the importance of those discussions—I should like to answer in greater detail tomorrow in order that I may have an opportunity of checking exactly what has developed during the last two or three months.

I do not wish that answer to indicate there has been any change in policy, but I would like to give my right hon. friend the details.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Prime Minister, and suggest that when he is giving that answer he might be able to amplify the statement made by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Winters) in September last, to the effect that changes would be made in existing regulations to permit the sale to be effected.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I must re-emphasize that my answer should not be taken as indicating there have been any changes. I should be glad to discuss this matter as well with the Minister of Trade and Commerce.